App. F. IX-4

Previous References
SA 27-24(2-13)
SA 94-28(5-8)
Later References
SA 333-31(1+2)
" 361-36(1-2)

193C.
(SA)

File No. 498-30
Serial Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4

Preserve

By 28/8/42

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. Four

Part B for September 1937

SUBJECT.

Separate registry of the Pattayam Perusu of Rs 29/4/4 in the name of minor Nanjundappa Naik of ~~the~~ Rayadurg Family.

8(4) Do Comptroller, M 1757 of 11.9.37

Sanctions are above

Ans 21/9/37

General and Revenue Secretariat — S&A — File No 498 of 193 0.

Serial No.	
1	From Mr. R. P. Koneti Nayak dt 20.6.31.

Of Raising Family —— Prays for reasons stated that a maintenance allowance of Rs 12/- per may be paid to her daughter-in-law Muddamanjamamma widow of late son-Rajagopal Naik instead of Rs 29/- prayed by her to the State Huzur Treasury Officer

The report of the State Huzur Treasury Officer on the subject has not yet been received from the Comptroller —

2 Draft forwarding the petition for enquiry report is submitted for approval.

1/7/31

20.7.31

2 Do Comptroller, No H(27)9.7.31

Forwards the petition for enquiry report

memo: No: H. 582 dt 20.7.31. forwarding the petition of Annamamma to the S.H.Try Officer thro' Comptroller for a report.

3 Letter No: 1298/ S.H.Try dated 29/8/31 From the Comptroller.

NOTE—Contn. Sheets.

WD 02553—G PB—50,000—8-7-30

a report of the Officer in charge of S.H.Try on the petition of Konati Naik regarding the grant of maintenance allowance to his widowed daughter-in-law Muadu-nanjammanni - etc.

4. The recommendation made by the S.H.Try Officer in penultimate paragraph of his report is for Govt orders - Submitted with references.

Govt
2/9

Addl Secy
3.9.31

5. The only point for consideration and orders is the representation of Muddu nanjammanni widow of the first son of the Bhaavandar and guardian of the latter's grandson Nanjundappa Naick minor for the separation of 1/3rd share in the family pension, in view of the fact that she lives with her father in law.

6. It is the petitioner's case that she is entitled to a third part in the pension drawn of 8/18/9 registered in the name of Konati Nagappa is incorrect. Reference is invited in this connection to the Addl Dept note of 9.7.25 which contains the relevant facts of the case of this family.

7 The reason recorded by the S.H.Try, I think his recommendation to grant parcel

Secretariat SA File No. 498 of 1930-1

Serial No.

Rs 29-4-4 arrs of the family pension and registered separately in the name of Kachaleeddi of the minor ~~son~~ - Nanjundappa Naick - son of Rajagopal Naick - (deceased) his late son of the Bangarupalya - is reasonable and may be sanctioned -

S.N- is not necessary to separately ~~the~~ register the amounts of Rs 29-00 now drawable to the Widows and daughter of the Bangarupalya 2nd son (late deceased), and revise the PO of 19th June 1929 -

There is no application hitherto effected from the ~~in~~ parties interested in this arrangement - and no advice in the matter of ~~a fresh~~ disbursal of this share of the ~~pen~~ pension is called for now.

Dewan)

3-9-31

9. I agree

Mr. 5/9/31

10. Submit with a draft.

GS 7/9

Issue after formality

~~Draft for approval~~

~~Dewan~~) H. Secy.) 7-9-31

DEWAN'S OFFICE 4 SEP 1931

2956 84

PRINTING SECTION 9 SEP 1931 GENL. & REV. SECT.

NOTE – Contn. Sheet

WD 02553—50,000—GPB—8-7 30

SIA File No. 498 of 193 0.

General and Revenue Secretariat

(81-4) To, The Comptr., G.O. No. 1757 dt 10.9.931.

Sanctions the recommendation of the State Huzur Try. Officer & parcel out ~~the~~ 29-6-4 out of the family pension, and register it in the name of Ranjundappa Naik minor by guardian mother Ranjanmanni - his mother.

B
VII
14/11

FINANCIAL BRANCH
7695
24 JUNE 1931
GENL. & REV. SECTN.

23 JUNE 1931

SrA 498-30—1

Rajakarya Parayana

B.Srinivasa Iyengar. Esqr.,B.A. B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Financial Department.BANGALORE CITY

Sir,

I the undersigned petitioner (R.P.Koneti Nayak, Pollegar,Roayadurga, Residing at 149, Cotton pet,Bangalore City) most respectfully beg to submit the following for kind perusal and necessary favourable orders of Government in the matter.

My daughter-in-law Muddunajammanniamma , widow of my son Rajagopalanayak deceased, residing at Cottonpetta, submitted a petition to the Officer in charge of the State Huzur Treasury on 9th June 1931 praying that a portion of the Pollegar Pension now being disbursed to me, may be - disbursed to her for her maintenance. In this connection I was sent for by the above said Treasury Officer on-the 16th June 1931. As I was not doing well and being old and infirm, I engaged a Lawyer duly instructed. Mr.S.Krishnapp- Advocate, Chikpet Bangalore city who appeared on my behalf was not given a fair oppertunity to represent my case. I was also present at the place.Even though I respectfully submitted my case and the several difficulties which stand in the way of my pension being reduced and the untold difficulti -es that I will be put into,my statement was not taken into consideration by the said Officer. Therefore I said that the Officer may do anything that pleases him best. No oppertuity

Was

No oppertunity was given to me to submit my written statement. Even the Vakalat which I gave to the Lawyer was discarded.

The Petitioner Muddunanjammaniamma states in her statement that I have not given her the maintenance charges during the past two months. This statement is totally untrue. She was under my protection till the 3rd June 1931. She went to her mother's house on the evening of 3-6-31 at 5.P.M. Her mother was not in godd terms with me during the past 10 or 12 years. All/ these years she was under the fostering care of my protection along with her husband my son. Since May last she has discarded the Gosha zealously observed by all the ladies of Pollegar community, and is going her own way without any regard to me or to the noble family to which she belongs. My advise to her to behave better ended only in embittering her feelings towards me. The advice given to her by the other members of our community, shared no better. Therefore she went over to her mother who was not on good terms with me and began to work against me and my reputation. In this connection I may be permitted to point out that her mother was an amazon who even presented herself in several Civil and Criminal Courts cases. She has a son who with the help of his mother and sister insults me on every possible occasion and even belaboured me on the evening of 3-6-1931

The petitioner my daughter-in-law has stated in her petition to the Treasury Officer that a sum of Rs.29/- out of my pension Rs.87-10-3 may be ordered to be paid to her as is being paid to the two widows of my younger son who are also being paid the sum of Rs.29/- out of this pension

At the time when a sum of Rs.29/- was ordered to be paid to the two widows of my younger son, I had represented that I was involved in heavy debts incurred not for my sake but for the sake of my sons and their wives. This was not at all taken into consideration. However it was ordered that a sum of Rs.29/- out of my pension to be given to the widows of my younger son. Since them my debts began to grow and I could not find any possible means of discharging them. To make the matters worse, my eldest son fell ill involving very heavy expenses to the extent of several hundreds of rupees in affording him the medical relief. Even them he was not spared. He finally breathed his last. The after ceremonials etc., consumed large and heavy amounts which was all borrowed and thus my debts grew very heavy. If as prayed for by the petitioner, a further sum of Rs.29/4 is to be deducted from my small pension, I find it immpossible to maintain myself and to discharge the debts.

In this connection I beg to submit that the petitioner my daughter in law has a boy of only 6 years old and he has to be brought up and educated. I therefore pray that it may kindly be ordered that she may place herself under my foestering care with a view to educate the boy or a small sum of only Rs.10/- may kindly be ordered to be paid to her out of my pension. Her other sister who is also my daughter in law is receiving a similar portion out of my pension.

In this connection I beg permission to point out the considerate treatment accorded to the Pollegars in the Madras Presidency. The pension disbursed to Pollegars is not permitted to be parcelled out if any minor claims were put forward by the wife, daughter-in-law and others. All these have to be under the care and protection of the head man of the family. Besides on occasions of marriage, death, education of Pollegar children etc., substantial financial help is given always on a liberal scale. It is on account of these reasons and several others, the Pollegars in the Madras presidency are far happier and better than their unfortunate and miserable brothers in Mysore. There are instances at which the petitioners have been refused to comply with their requests for the grant of a portion of the Pollegar pension. Therefore all the relatives of one Pollegar community live in perfect harmony as members of one house. Besides this enables the head of a pollegar - family to live decently and preserve the tarditional nobility and greatness of the line to which he belongs. I therefore pray that similar treatment may kindly be accorded to the Pollegars of Mysore State.

There is another very important point which I beg to submit for favourable consideration. When the petitioners pray only for a portion of my pension to be disbursed to them, why not they also pray to share a portion or a proportionate portion of the debts wholly and chiefly incurred on their behalf. In case they claim a part of my pension, it is only right that they should share a portion of debts. Now I am 70 years old and suffering from diabetes. I sincerely pray that you will kindly take all these into consideration when deciding the claim of the other petitioner.

In case if it is ordered that a sum of Rs.29/- has to be deducted from my small pension, it will be impossible to find a way to discharge the debts and lead a respectful life. My creditors will surely take into their possession my other small properties and place me in a Civil Jail. Thus the living head man of a well known Pollegar family of Royadurga State will have to sit in a Civil Jail at his 70th year in his oldage and infirmity. I therefore humbly pray that the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore will kindly take all these into their considerations and pass early orders favourable to the present petitioner and your humble servant.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

ಕೊನೆಟಿನಾಯಕ

20th June 1931.
Bangalore city.

Sd.Konetinayak.

Bangalore

16th July 1931.

To

The Financial Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

Under Government Order No. FI 5429/s+A94-28 dated 19th January'29 a sum of Rs.12/- has been defined to me from the pension of Mr. R.P. Koneti Naik, Pollegar of Rajadurg who is the head baravaradar. Mr. Koneti Naik has been very irregular in making payments to me and putting me to inconvenience by not drawing the amount in time and not depositing the amount of my share. It is now the 15th and still he has not drawn the pension and not deposited in the Treasury. I am given to understand that he has gone to Madura and is not known when he will return. I I am a helpless widow having no other resource to maintain myself except this pension amount. I therefore beg that arrangements may kindly be made to pay the amount directly from the Treasury without waiting upon the good graces of the baravardar who is not in good terms with me. I beg that immediate relief be given to me as I am starving.

I remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

ಅಮೃತಮ್ಮ

Pmt with [illegible] 22 JULY 1931

3102/A

To

The Financial Secretary to Government
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

656.

Sir,

On my application dated 9th June 1931 to the Khazana Bakshi, State Huzur Treasury, Bangalore, he was pleased to pass an -- order after hearing Mr. Koneti Naik and his counsel that the amount of Rs.29-2-10 due to me out of the family pension of Rs.87-8-9 be ~~xxxxxxxx~~ deposited in the Treasury to be drawn by me, Mr. Koneti Naik, the baravardar has gone away to Madura as anticipated by me in my application in order to put me to further hardship and reduce me to his mercy. I had urged in that petition that he had not paid me my share of pension for two previous months and he has purposely played this trick to wreck his vengence on me. You could very well imagine how -- myself a helpless widow with two young children - houseless, penniless could afford to maintain myself in these hard days. I would therefore very humbly beseech you to kindly have my share separately registered in the name of my minor son, myself as guardian and save me from all further cruelty which my -- father-in-law Mr. Koneti Naik is determined to show against me as I was not willing to be a slave to his conqubine with whom he is living shamelessly here.

I remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

[illegible]

Bangalore,
16th July 1931.

H.C. 582 dt 20-7-31
Forwarded for compliance with Comptroller's remarks in favour of enquiry and that in Contingent file No. K/2 SHA 495/3
9-7-31
16-7-31
A

Appendix F G–1]

SUBJECT.....

Section S & A

File No. 498/30

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to 7695

No. 127

To

The Comptroller

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Sir,

I am directed to forward for favour of early enquiry & report the accompanying petition dated 20/6/31 from Mr. R. P. Kunchi Naine (no. H 7695) requesting the grant of maintenance allowance to his daughter-in-law (widowed) Muthumanjammanni wife of ~~[illegible]~~ on the ~~Variant~~ allegations made therein.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Date of issue 9/7/31

Signed by [illegible] for Secretary

List of enclosures 1

Copied by [illegible]

Examined by.....

Fl 127/S+A 49830 - 2

3rd July 1931.

Financial

xxxxxxxxxxx

The Comptroller to Government
B a n g a l o r e.

I am directed to forward for favour of early enquiry and report the accompanying petition No.Fl.7695 dated 20th June 1931 from Mr. K.P Konati Naik regarding the grant of maintenance allowance to ~~her~~ his widowed daughterinlaw Muddunanjammanni on the allegations made therein.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For Financial Secretary to Gov

c,n,

SHA 498-30-3

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

1 SEP 1931

Comptroller's Office, Bangalore,

No. 1296 S.H.Try *Dated the* 29th August *1931.*
Exhibit

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Financial Department, Bangalore.

FINANCIAL BRANCH 965 1931 GENL & REV. SECTT.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.Fl.127-S.A.198-30 dated 3rd July 1931 and Memo No.Fl.582 dated 20th July 1931, I have the honor to forward herewith for orders of Government the report of the officer in charge of the State Huzur Treasury on the petitions of Mr. R.P.Koneti Naik Pallegar of Rayadurga Family regarding the grant of maintenance allowance to his widowed daughter-in-law Mudda Nanjammanni on the allegations made therein.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Comptroller

No.139 S.H.Try.

Office of the State Huzur Treasury,

Bangalore, 28th August 1931.

From

M. S. Ramachandra Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Senior Assistant Commissioner in charge of
State Huzur Treasury,
Bangalore.

To

S. Shamanna, Esq., B.A.,
Comptroller to the Govt.of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with the Financial Secretary's letter No.Fl.127-S.A.198-30 dated 3rd July 1931 and his memo No.Fl.582 dated 20th July 1931 regarding the division of the family pension of Rs87-8-9 enjoyed by the Rayadroog Pallegar Family, I have the honor to state that the present registered barawardar of the pension is one Mr. R. P. Koneti Naik who had two sons by name Raja Gopala Naik and Venkatapathi Naik both of whom are now dead. During the life time of these sons he was sharing his pension equally with each of them and all the three were living separately. For some time all went well. But dissenssions having subsequently arisen, on the motion of Ammanniamma, who had separated herself from her husband Venkatapathi Naik, Government in their order No.Fl.1328/S.A.27-24-13 dated 29th August 1925 were pleased to order that out of the family pension of Rs87-8-9 a sum of Rs29/- should be treated as the share of Mr. R. P. Venkatapathi Naik and out of this share Rs15/- should be paid to the petitioner (Ammanniamma with effect from 1st September 1925.

2. The said R. P. Venkatapathi Naik died on 25th August 1928, On his death, his father Mr. R. P. Koneti Naik presented a petition on 26th October 1928 praying for the reversion to him of the

separated

separated pension of his deceased son. Government thereupon passed orders in their Proceedings No.Fl.5429/S.A.1-94-28 dated 19th January 1929 sanctioning the proposals of the State Huzur Treasury Officer to the effect that Nanjammanni the daughter of Ammanniamma the first wife may be granted an allowance of Rs5/- per mensem, till her marriage, and the remainder of Rs24/- be equally divided between the aforesaid Ammanniamma and Akkayyamma (alias Ammanniamma) the second wife, and that the question of the shares should be examined after the daughter is married or when any of the sharers die."

3. The contingency contemplated in the second part of the order has also since happened since Rajagopala Naik the first son also died on 20th September 1929. He has left behind him his wife the petitioner Muddunanjammanni, one son named Nanjundappa Naik aged about 7 years and a daughter Saradamma aged about two years. Muddunanjammanni went to live with her father-in-law Mr. Koneti Naik after her husband's death. But owing to her not receiving proper treatment at his hands she seems to have left him about four months ago and to be now residing with her mother.

4. About two months ago, to be exact on 9th June 1931, she presented a petition to me setting out all these facts and praying that her share of the pension may be paid to her separately, I thereupon issued a notice to Mr. Koneti Naik and held an enquiry on 16th June 1931.

5. On this date both the parties appeared before me, and I questioned them in the presence of one another and tried to bring about an amicable settlement. But it was not possible. Muddunanjammanni flatly refused to go and live with her father-in-law and insisted on her minor son's share being separately registered and paid to her independently of him. At first Mr. Koneti Naik demurred but after being advised about the facts of the case, and the law on the subject, he finally consented to the arrangement. While I was reducing his statement into

writing

writing some gentleman, who subsequently was found out to be his lawyer came and asked for an adjournment of the proceedings to enable him to obtain copies and file a written statement. I asked him if he had got a vakalat. He replied he had not got it, but would file one later on if required. I then told him that as the matter had already been well nigh settled, nothing could be done at that stage. I however told him that if he had anything to say, I was prepared to hear him. But he said that he had not received instructions and it was to receive instructions that he asked for an adjournment. Muddu-nanjammanni and her agent however having strongly objected, with good reason, to an adjournment being granted at that stage, there was no other alternative but to proceed to pass orders in terms of the petitioner's request to which the counter-petitioner had also voluntarily agreed. This is all that happened, and it is greatly to be regretted that matters should have been grossly misrepresented in the written representation subsequently presented to the Financial Secretary under report.

6. Thus it is not true that the memorialist (Mr. R.P.Koneti Naik) was "not given a fair opportunity to represent his case". Nor is it true that his statement was "not taken into consideration" as alleged. As the lawyer did not give any vakalat at all there was no occasion to discard it.

Coming to the other allegations we have nothing to do with the quarrels between the petitioner and the counter-petitioner referred to in para 3.

The allegations in para 4 savour of a protest against the G.O. of 29th August 1925, which cannot be accepted at this distance of time. Those reasons must have been urged and duly considered before the Government Order in question was passed. In fact the preamble to the Government Order of 19th January 1929 shows that Mr. R. P. Koneti Naik then alone attempted to secure the whole of the family pension to himself to the prejudice of his daughter-in-law and grand daughter and the Government Order was passed in order to safe-guard

the

the interests of the latter. Accordingly the allowances of the two widows and the daughter of the senior widow were ordered to be separately distributed to them. Although it is abundantly clear from this Government Order that Mr. Koneti Naik should have nothing to do with them and that they should be paid to the women independently of him as a matter of practice he has been drawing the whole of the pension and depositing the women's share with the Treasurer who afterwards distributes it to the latter. This practice is however not warranted by the Government Order and may have a tendency to defeat the very purpose of ordering separate distribution.

7. The case of the petitioner Muddunanjammanni is on all fours with that of her co-sisters and is perhaps even better than the latter inasmuch as she has a son by name Nanjundappa Naik aged seven years and it has to be disposed of on the same principles. She is distinctly opposed to live with her father-in-law or to have anything to do with him. The very representation he has submittedto Government contains abundant evidence of his hostile attitude to his widowed daughter-in-law and minor grand children, and there is no doubt that if the whole of the pension is left in his name he will very soon squander it or create charges upon it to the prejudice of these latter. This cannot be permitted. No reliance can be placed on his promises to look after them.

8. Thus having regard to all the circumstances of the case, I recommend that the family pension of Rs87-8-9 which now stands in the sole name of Mr. Koneti Naik may be split up into three equal parts and registered and paid separately direct to the parties concerned from the treasury as follows:-

(1) Rs29-4-5 to Mr. R. P. Koneti Naik as his share of the family pension

(2) Rs29-4-4 to Nanjundappa Naik minor son of Mr. Koneti Naik eldest son Rajagopala Naik and sole surviving co-parcener his mother Muddunanjammanni being appointed his guardian until he attains majority.

(3) Rs29-0-0 to be distributed as maintenance allowances among the two widows and daughter of Venkatapathi Naik the deceased 2nd son of Mr. Koneti Naik as follows:-

p.t.o.

(a) 12- 0- 0 to senior widow Ammanniamma
(b) 12- 0- 0 to junior widow Ammanniamma alias Akkayyamma
(c) 5- 0- 0 to Nanjammanni daughter of the senior widow subject to revision when Nanjammanni is married or any of the widows die.

9. A geneological tree showing the relationship of the parties is appended.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

K.S. Ramachandra Rao

Officer in charge,
State Huzur Treasury.

BRR

MSR

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Read:—

Correspondence ending with letter No. 298/S.H. Try. dated 29th August 1931, from the Comptroller to Government, forwarding a report of the Officer in charge of the State Huzur Treasury on the petitions of Mr. R.P. Koneti Naik of Rayadurga Pallegar Family and of his widowed daughter-in-law Muddu Nanjammanni.

Order No. Hl 1757/S&A 498-30-4

Bangalore, dated the 10th September 1931.

The only point for consideration and orders at present is the representation of Muddu Nanjammanni, widow of the first son of the barawardar Mr. R.P. Koneti Naik and guardian of her son Nanjundappa Naik minor for the separate registration in favour of the latter of 1/3rd share of the family pension of Rs. 87-8-9.

2. That the petitioner's husband was entitled to a third part of the pension of Rs. 87-8-9 registered in the name of Mr. Koneti Naik is undisputed. On a consideration of the circumstances of the case, Government are pleased to sanction the recommendation of the State Huzur Treasury Officer to parcel out Rs. 29-4-4 out of the family pension and register it separately in the name of Nanjundappa Naik minor by guardian Muddu Nanjammanni his mother.

For Financial Secretary to Government.

To

The Comptroller to Government with records with the ~~instruction~~ request to ~~issue~~ suitable endorsements to the parties may be issued

TRM.2

SUBJECT

Section S+A
File No. 498-30
Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to R-965/31.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 11-9-31

Signed by AVR

May this be

i. printed?

ii. treated as a standing order?

iii. published in the Gazette English Part?

iv. translated?

v. placed at the disposal of the press?

vi. published in the Gazette, Kannada Part?

List of enclosures

Copied by WPG

Examined by

Read—

Petition dated 20.6.31 from Mr. R. P. Kaneri Naik of Royadrug Poligar family praying that a maintenance allowance of Rs 12/- pm only may be paid to his daughter-in-law Muddunanjammanni, widow of his first son Rajagopala Naik ~~instead of Rs 29/- as prayed for~~ ✓

~~Order Thereon No.~~

2 Petitions dated 16-7-31 from Srimati Muddunanjammanni requesting that her husband's share of the family pension of Rs 87-8-9 may be separately registered in the name of her minor son Nanjunda Naik

With letter no: 298/S.H.Try dated 29.8.31.
from the Comptroller forwarding
~~Proceedings of Govt~~ A report of
the Officer in charge of the State
Huzur Treasury on the petitions
of Mr. R. P. Koneti Naik of Penyadoy Paliyam family
~~regarding~~
~~the grant of maintenance allowance.~~
and of his widowed daughter-in-law
Muddunayammanni -

Order no: 71/1757 dated.

The only point for consideration
and orders at present is the representation
of Muddunayammanni, widow
of the first son of the Bavavardar
Mr. R. P. Koneti Naik and guardian
of ~~the~~ her son Ranjundatta Naik
minor for the separation of 1/3 share
of the family pension of Rs 87-8-9 —
~~in view of the fact that she continued~~
~~to reside with her father-in-law.~~
2. That the petitioner's husband
was entitled to a third part of
the pension of Rs 87-8-9 registered

G. R. S. App F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

in the name of Mr. Ranchhodlal is undisputed, ~~as he was one of those male members entitled to an equal part.~~ as recorded by the ~~Officer in charge of the State Huzur Treasury~~ Collector on a consideration of the whole circumstances, Govt: are pleased to sanction the recommendation of the State Huzur by giving to Parvatibai Mt Rs 29-4-4 out of the family pension and register it separately in the name of Ranjendatta Hathi minor by guardian Muddunanjammanni, his mother.

8/9/31

Addl Fin: Secy: to Govt
7.9.31

To The Comptroller. with records with the instruction to issue suitable endorsements to the parties.

Dr On a cautious examination of the circumstances of the case

WD 0327—GPD—10,000—18-5-27